

LC 113
B7 N3



AN OPEN LETTER TO THE LOYAL CITIZENS OF BOSTON.

AN APPEAL

FROM THE LOYAL WOMEN OF AMERICAN LIBERTY.

Judge Fallon's Resignation, and a Review of his Reasons therefor.

Fellow Citizens: — We, the Loyal Women of American Liberty, a women's patriotic association founded for the maintenance and preservation of our civil and religious liberties and the protection of our public school system from ecclesiastical interference, desire, in the interests of justice and truth, to ask your earnest and impartial consideration of the facts we lay before you in this open letter in connection with the statements made by Judge Fallon in his resignation from the Boston School Board. In submitting this document for your consideration, we would assure you that we are not actuated by feelings of bigotry and intolerance, but by conscientious convictions that an injustice has been done the present School Board, as well as the friends and patriots of our cherished institutions, and also for the enlightenment of our Roman Catholic friends (whose champion Mr. Fallon proclaims himself); for we desire they should be made acquainted with both sides of the question, and thus have an opportunity of judging for themselves. We claim for the Roman Catholic American citizen the same right to send his child to our public schools that Protestant citizens have, without ecclesiastical intimidation.

First, Judge Fallon in his resignation mentions that after nearly twenty years of faithful and conscientious devotion to the best interests of our public schools, he feels impelled, as a public protest against the influences which have prevailed in the city during the last two years, and which now prevail in the Board, to tender his resignation, and gives the following reasons for the step he has taken. We quote Mr. Fallon's own words, as reported by the press in the *Boston Herald* :—

"During the many years that I have been a member of the School Board, as I stated at our last meeting, my constant care, aim and purpose always have been to raise our schools to a high degree of efficiency, to extend their usefulness so that they might attract and educate in friendly intercourse and in harmonious unity the children of every class and denomination in our whole community; to make them the pride and boast and ornament of our city; and with this end in view, in strict accord with the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and the laws of the commonwealth, to guard them sacredly against all sectarian or other contaminating influences."

LC 113
B7 N3

If, as Judge Fallon states, he has served the interests of the public schools of the city with such faithful and constant devotion, if his aim and purpose have always been to raise our schools to a high degree of efficiency, to make them the pride and boast and ornament of our city, in strict accord with the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and the laws of the commonwealth, to guard them sacredly against all sectarian as well as other contaminating influences, how does he account for the following facts in connection with the public schools of Boston during his twenty years of faithful and conscientious administration, facts which were thoroughly investigated by the Committee of One Hundred, and published by them in their circular, "The Great Victory in Boston," a document which has had an immense circulation.

1. The Committee of One Hundred discovered in 1888 that the school committee of twenty-four was composed of twelve Roman Catholics, eleven Protestants, and one Jew; and that the schools had been run in the interests of Roman Catholicism.

2. For years the text-books had been submitted to the examination of Jesuit priests, and until they were mutilated to suit the interests of these men, they could not be used.

3. That other books, as for instance Dickens' *Child's History of England*, and Miss Thompson's *History of England*, were from time to time quietly removed because they contained things displeasing to the Roman Catholic church.

4. That competent and experienced Protestant teachers had been persistently and steadily dismissed, and their places filled by incompetent Roman Catholic teachers.

5. That the masters to whose schools the incompetent Roman Catholic teachers were appointed, were given to understand that if they cared aught for their places and their salaries they had better keep still and say nothing.

6. In some instances priests would warn teachers not to mark Roman Catholic children late or absent, who were off attending mass, otherwise "they would pay for it"; while in other cases a priest would go to a school during school hours, and have leave given him to take out Roman Catholic scholars, that they might attend some mission service in the Roman Catholic church.

7. Almost all division committees having in charge the public schools, had in them Roman Catholic majorities, while the other standing committees were largely formed in the same interest, while on some of the most important committees all the members were Roman Catholics.

If Judge Fallon aimed to raise our schools to a high degree of efficiency and to extend their usefulness, why did he not (if he considered himself a faithful and conscientious member of the School Board) oppose the removal of competent teachers, allowing their places to be filled by incompetent teachers; and how strange it should be that the competent teachers were Protestants and the incompetent were Roman Catholics! How could the latter assist Judge Fallon to raise our public schools to a high degree of efficiency?

Again, what law of the commonwealth gives power to a School Board to permit Roman Catholic priests to take children away from their studies during school hours for the express purpose of attending a religious service? and how dare a Roman Catholic priest in free America warn our teachers, and compel them under fear to break the rule laid down by the proper authorities, (that of marking a pupil absent or late), because such a pupil was attending mass in a Roman Catholic church? The teacher is the servant of the state, not of the representative of either Protestant or Roman Catholic church.

Another aim of Judge Fallon, according to his own statement, was to guard our schools "sacredly against all sectarian or other contaminating influences." Did he hope to accomplish this by silently allowing the text-books to be submitted to Jesuit priests, and mutilated to serve the purposes of Roman Catholicism?

Surely a faithful and conscientious American citizen, serving for nearly twenty years on the Boston School Board,—such as Judge Fallon,—should have uttered a most emphatic protest against this sacredly sectarian and un-American proceeding; or was silence on the part of Judge Fallon in respect to the occurrences in the public schools of Boston during his long term of administration his peculiar method of proving himself faithful and conscientious to the trust reposed in him by the citizens of Boston?

Judge Fallon next says:—

"Thoroughly imbued with these ideas, sincerely actuated by those just and laudable motives, the School Board of 1888, recognizing the just and equal rights of all our citizens, when called upon, promptly responded to the call to eliminate from our schools instruction which slandered the religion of more than half our pupils. With a generous forbearance which should have commended itself to every fair-minded person in the community, they merely transferred the offending instructor from the position of teacher of mediæval history to the position of teacher of ancient history; and instead of the text-book which was blamed for the slander, they adopted another text-book, a book written by a Protestant from a Protestant standpoint, a book 'used in many of the best schools in the country,' and recommended by the most distinguished Protestant educators in the United States, a book by no means acceptable to the Roman Catholic members of the Board, but favored by them for the reason that it was not positively offensive to their religious belief."

To whose call did the School Board of 1888 promptly respond? Was it issued by the majority of our Boston citizens? Certainly not; but as Judge Fallon may have forgotten the important points of the Swinton-Travis case (in consequence of the many harrassing School-Board duties he has had to perform), we would submit the following facts from one of the most reliable sources, that of the report of the Committee of One Hundred in their publication before mentioned, "The Great Victory in Boston," issued by that organization and accepted as unquestionable and unprejudiced authority by the intelligent citizens of our republic:—

"On the 8th of May, 1888, the Rev. Theodore Metcalf, a Roman Catholic priest, complained in a letter to the School Board, which was immediately published in the papers, that Mr. Charles B. Travis of the English High School, had 'trespassed on the forbidden ground of religion, and made statements which were an outrage to Catholics, in his endeavor to explain the Catholic doctrine of indulgences.' This communication was referred to the Committee on High Schools, and notwithstanding Mr. Travis, in a letter to the chairman of the committee, most emphatically denied that the statements made to elucidate the passage on indulgences were ever 'put in such a way as to throw ridicule or contempt upon any religion,' that committee, in a report signed by J. D. Blake, William C. Williamson, Joseph D. Fallon, Thomas O'Grady (all Catholics save Williamson), sustained the charge, and recommended that Mr. Travis be transferred to some other department, and the text-book, which they held misled the teacher, be removed. The report was accepted, and Swinton's *Outlines of the World's History*, which had been in use in the schools for ten years, was taken out, and Mr. Travis, who had been a teacher for some twenty years, was transferred from mediæval to ancient history. The ground taken by the priest was that Swinton's *History* is a sectarian book, but this is not so. Like all other impartial historians, Swinton simply records an unpleasant fact in the history of the Romish church, concerning the sale of indulgences which happened a few hundred years ago. The school committee removed the book because they said, "its teaching is not correct; it conveys the impression that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin." Swinton's *History* teaches nothing of the kind (see tract 'Substitute for Swinton Romanized')."

How prominently Judge Fallon's faithful and conscientious principles are manifested in the report of the Committee on High Schools—a committee of one Protestant and three Roman Catholics, the faithful and conscientious Judge being one of the number, and a host in himself—how magnanimous the committee were in their report! But the citizens of old Puritan Boston were not quite satisfied with this report, or with the action of the School Board in adopting the recommendation, and because they chose to gather together in old Faneuil Hall and Tremont Temple to protest against priestly and sectarian interference, and to allow these troublesome people to see that Americans were not yet ready to give up their free institutions into the keeping of an ecclesiastical government, Judge Fallon calls this truly American protest a "no-popey howl." We, as an association, feel gratified that Judge Fallon has found out that Americans can howl, and all presumptuous ecclesiastics who dare to dictate to Americans in respect to the cherished institutions of our land will find that they can do something more practical than mere howling, and that the screech of the American eagle will be heard over the din of battle and the roar of the cannon, and that not only our schools will be preserved but our teachers protected from priestly intimidation.

As far as the defeat of James S. Murphy is concerned, Mr. Fallon makes a very erroneous and unjust statement. Mr. Murphy had every chance at the polls; he was highly recommended by some of the citizens of Boston,—ladies and gentlemen,—together with the signatures of his friends and admirers, appearing in the daily papers of our city, thus giving the qualified voters of Boston the opportunity of knowing how highly he was esteemed. If after reading this testimonial of confidence Mr. Murphy was defeated, surely the men and women who used the right granted to every American voter, (that of casting their ballot according to conviction), should not be accused of hypocrisy or intolerance. Mr. Murphy, in one respect, was more fortunate than two out of the eight candidates, for his name appeared on the official ballot of the two great political parties, as well as on that of the woman suffragists, so that he had every opportunity afforded him. If the people had wanted him he would have been elected.

Judge Fallon's criticism of the actions of the present School Board is both unjust and decidedly anti-Protestant. He claims that the "Board has, by a recorded vote of 17 to 2, put into the public schools of this city the two most bigoted, objectionable and anti-Catholic histories which I have ever examined." Judge Fallon also claims that "In the whole range of Catholic literature, from the simplest catechism placed in a child's hands to the most learned treatise on dogmatic theology, there is no doctrine more explicitly taught, no one more thoroughly understood than this: Adoration belongs to God alone. Yet Myers says on page 520, that 'the adoration of the Virgin' is a 'doctrine' of the Catholic church."

The question now is whether Myers has stated what is correct or false. Mr. Fallon has given wide scope when he says "in the whole range of Catholic literature." An impartial investigation of authentic Roman Catholic literature proves very clearly and distinctly that Myers is correct in his statement that adoration of the Virgin Mary is recognized by the Roman Catholic church, and that she invests Mary with power equal to Christ. She is called "The Queen of Heaven," and in "The Glories of Mary" (one of the most popular and highly commended books of Roman Catholic devotion to Mary, the American edition to which bears the imprint of the late Archbishop Hughes of New York, and

can be purchased at Noonan's Catholic bookstore, Boylston St., Boston), we find on page 155 that "the Most Holy Mary is Queen not only of heaven and of the saints, but also of hell and of devils." The latter certainly is not a very enviable distinction.

The Bible teaches that God alone is omnipotent, but we find on pages 202 and 203 of "The Glories of Mary," the following: "Thou art the mother of God, omnipotent to save sinners, and need'st no other recommendation with God, since thou art the mother of true life." Again on the same page we read: "The Lord, O holy Virgin! has so exalted thee, that by his favor thou canst obtain all graces for thy servants, for thy protection is omnipotent. Yes, Mary is omnipotent, since the queen by every law must enjoy the same privileges as the King; for as the power of the Son and mother are the same, the mother, by the omnipotent Son, is made omnipotent. God has placed the whole church not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary. As the mother then, must have the same power as the son, justly was Mary made omnipotent by Jesus, who is omnipotent, it being, however, always true that whereas the Son is omnipotent by nature the mother is so by grace." Will Judge Fallon, or any Roman Catholic prelate or priest inform the public when and how Mary was made omnipotent by Christ? When was she invested with power equal to the Son of God? There is no account of the circumstance in the Bible.

Again the church calls Mary "the refuge of sinners," and as such she is invoked in the "Litany of Loretta," and the "Glories of Mary," on page 128, speaking of her under this title, says: "I am the City of Refuge for all those who flee to me." And on page 129, "Assemble yourselves, and let us enter into the fenced city and be silent there. This fenced city is the Holy Virgin, whose defence is grace and glory." Let us be silent then. Since we may not dare to supplicate the Lord for pardon, it is enough that we enter into the city and are silent, for then Mary will speak and pray for us. A devout writer exhorts all sinners to seek shelter under the mantle of Mary, saying, "Fly, O Adam! O Eve! and ye their children, who have offended God—fly, and take refuge in the bosom of this good mother! Do you not know she is the only city of refuge, the only hope of sinners? '*Unica speo speccatorum.*'" Hence St. Ephrem salutes her: "Thou art the only advocate of sinners, and of those who are deprived of every help. Hail! refuge and retreat of sinners, to whom alone they can flee with confidence!"

The church invests Mary with divine power by making her omnipresent; and, as Judge Fallon is aware, omnipresent means present in every place. If Mary can hear the prayers of all who invoke her aid, then she must be omnipresent; in fact, the Church of Rome holds that Mary has often assumed the form of various individuals and performed even the most menial duties in their absence from their post of duty. Further, Mary is credited with assuming the form and carrying out the duties of a nun, who for fifteen years lived in the world as a public sinner. Should Judge Fallon or any one else wish to verify this last assertion, they can do so by reading pages 224 and 225, "Glories of Mary."

Pope Gregory XVI., in 1832, says in his encyclical letter, dated August 15 of that year, "But that all things may have a prosperous and happy issue, let us raise our eyes and hands to the most holy Virgin Mary, who only destroys all heresies, and who is our greatest hope; yea, the entire ground of our hope."

If the facts we have given are not in strict accordance with the doctrines of the Church of Rome, why do we find them printed in the "Glories of Mary"? Did Gregory XVI., the then head of the church, the infallible guide, not realiz

that he sent forth into the Roman Catholic part of the world that which is directly opposed to her doctrines? Judge Fallon quotes the case of Galileo, as found in Sheldon's History used in public schools, as a specimen of the anti-Catholic slanders with which the two objectionable books, Myers' and Sheldon's, "are loaded," and which the present Board, by a vote of 17 to 2, have decided to use in the public schools.

We would now submit the following extracts from the text-books used to-day in the various parochial schools in our land, and let every fair-minded citizen of Boston decide whether Protestants are not justified in claiming that the statements in these text-books are false and slanderous. In the Catechism of Perseverance, on page 327, we find the following:—

Question. — Who was Luther?

Answer. — Luther was a German religious, of the Augustinian order, who violated his three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. He apostatized, married a nun, and commenced declaring against the Catholic church.

Ques. — What did he write previous to his condemnation?

Ans. — Previous to his condemnation he had written to the Sovereign Pontiff that he would receive his decision as an oracle from the mouth of Jesus Christ, but scarcely had Leo X. condemned his errors when he gave vent to the most vile abuse against him, against the bishops and theologians, impudently pretending that he alone was more enlightened than the whole Christian world. He persevered in preaching error, and after having led a scandalous life, died on leaving the table after having gorged himself with wines and meats.

Ques. — Who was Calvin?

Ans. — Calvin was an ecclesiastic of Noyon, but was never a priest. He went to Bourges, where he adopted the errors of Luther, to which he added his own. He settled in Geneva, where he burned to death Michael Servetus, who had the courage to differ from him, and finally died himself of a shameful disease.

Ques. — How do you show that Protestantism, or the religion preached by Luther, Zwingler, Calvin and Henry VIII., is not the pure religion?

Ans. — In order to show that Protestantism is a false religion, or, rather, no religion at all, it will be sufficient simply to bear in mind that it was established by four great libertines; that it owes its origin to the love of honors, covetousness of the goods of others and the love of sexual pleasures — three things forbidden by the Gospel; that it permits you to believe whatever you please, and to do whatever you believe; that it has deluged Germany, France, Switzerland and England, with blood, and leads to impiety, and finally to indifference — the source of all revolutions past and future. We must, therefore, be on our guard against those who preach it, and cherish a horror for the books which disseminate it. Again, in the "Familiar explanation of the Christian doctrine, adapted for the family and more advanced students in Catholic schools and colleges," which has the approbation of Archbishop Bailey of Baltimore, — Lesson XII., "No salvation outside the Roman Catholic church."

Ques. — Since the Roman Catholic church alone is the true church of Jesus, can any one who dies outside the church be saved?

Ans. — He cannot.

Ques. — Did Jesus Christ Himself assure us most solemnly, and in plain words, that no one can be saved out of the Roman Catholic church?

Ans. — He did, when He said to His apostles, Go and teach all nations.

Ques. — What do the fathers of the church say about the salvation of those who die out of the Roman Catholic church?

Ans. — They all, without exception, pronounce them infallibly lost.

Ques. — Are there any other reasons to show that heretics or Protestants who die out of the Roman Catholic church are not saved?

Ans. — There are several. They cannot be saved because: 1. They have no divine faith. 2. They make a liar of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and the apostles. 3. They have no faith in Christ. 4. They fell away from the true church. 5. They are too proud to submit to the Pope, the Vicar of Christ. 6. They do not perform any good works whereby they can obtain heaven. 7. They do not receive the body and blood of Christ. 8. They die in their sins. 9. They ridicule and blaspheme the mother of God and His saints. 10. They slander the spouse of Jesus Christ — the Catholic church.

Again on page 97:—

Ques.—Now do you think God, the Father, will admit into heaven those who thus make liars of His Son, Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles?

Ans. No; He will let them have their portion with Lucifer in hell, who first rebelled against Christ, and who is the father of liars.

Ques.—Have Protestants any faith in Christ?

Ans.—They never had.

Ques.—Why not?

Ans.—Because there never lived such a Christ as they imagine and believe in.

Ques.—In what kind of a Christ do they believe?

Ans.—In such a one of whom they can make a liar, etc.

Ques.—Will such a faith in such a Christ save Protestants?

Ans.—No sensible man will assert such an absurdity.

Ques.—What will Christ say to them on the day of judgment?

Ans.—I know you not,—because you never knew me.

Again, page 104:—

Ques.—Are Protestants willing to confess their sins to a Catholic bishop or priest, who alone has power from Christ to forgive sins? Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them.

Ans.—No, for they generally have an utter aversion to confession, and, therefore, their sins will not be forgiven throughout all eternity.

Ques.—What follows from this?

Ans.—That they die in their sins and are damned.

Here is a specimen of the instruction imparted by Roman Catholic teachers in their so-called Christian schools, and with the approbation of the archbishop of Baltimore, who in church dignity stands next to the American cardinal.

We appeal to the citizens of Boston, Protestant and Roman Catholic, and especially Judge Fallon, and ask if anything could be more objectionable than the abusive and deliberately false statements we have set forth in this document as quotations from the parochial school text-books.

Next, Judge Fallon says: "No fair-minded person would ever object to the ground taken by Catholics, as expressed in my report, viz., 'We claim that a text-book offensive to the religion of any class of our pupils should not be used in our schools.'"

Now what Mr. Fallon claims for Roman Catholics as their champion, is a privilege he should be willing to accord to Protestants. If he wishes to be perfectly just and "fair-minded," let him lay these extracts before Archbishop Williams, of Boston, and point out to the worthy prelate the justness of having all such passages as Protestants claim are slanderous and false, expunged from the parochial school text-books, reminding the archbishop of the rule of charity: "Do unto your neighbor as you would they should do unto you."

The next clause in Judge Fallon's resignation is a very amusing one. He says:

"If we cannot agree upon a text-book, let us omit altogether the study of mediæval history in our schools; or if we must have a text-book in that study, let us apply the same rule that is constantly applied in the division of property between heirs, say A and B. Let A make the division and give B his choice; or, if that is not satisfactory, let B make the division and give A his choice. We are willing to apply that rule. Let our Protestant brethren select any history they choose, written by a Catholic, and we will assent to it; or, if they insist that the history be one written by a Protestant, let us have the selection. But this proposition, so just, so fair, so reasonable, this platform so broad, so liberal, so safe that all our citizens, of whatever creed or religious belief, might stand on it in perfect equality, was silently, if not contemptuously, ignored by this Board."

It reminds one of a certain story. A Yankee and an Indian went out shooting; one shot a turkey and the other a crow. Difficulty arose as to how the birds should be divided, and after some discussion the Yankee said to the Indian

"I'll have the turkey and you have the crow; or, if you like, you can have the crow and I'll have the turkey."—"Um," said the Indian, "You no talk turkey to me, only crow."

We would say to Judge Fallon, "You talk no Protestant to the school committee, only Roman Catholic." No doubt the school committee saw the drift of Judge Fallon's proposition which he calls "so just, so fair, so reasonable, so broad, so liberal, so safe."

The verdict of the City of Boston, as expressed in the two last municipal elections, and the vote of the present School Board in respect to the adoption of Myers' and Sheldon's histories as text-books in the public schools, does not give Judge Fallon the right to assert that Catholic children have no rights in the public schools of our city which the loyal citizens of Boston are determined shall be carried on on American principles. The American Catholic children are welcome to the privileges of our free institutions; these privileges are their birthright, and American interests demand that the Roman Catholic and Protestant child should learn to love each other, and in order to do this there should be no separate schools. In placing Roman Catholic children in parochial schools, they are deprived of an education that would fit them for the responsible duties of American citizenship.

We, therefore, as a national association of liberty-loving, patriotic women, once more appeal to the citizens of Boston. Friday, July 11th, was the second anniversary of the protest of Boston citizens against ecclesiastical interference with our public schools. On that occasion old Faneuil Hall, the "Cradle of Liberty," rocked as it never rocked before, and a new child was born. The child has grown and strengthened, till its voice has been heard, and now speaks to every American heart in the name of "home and country." Citizens of Boston, shall we not listen to it? It points out to us the encroachments of papal ecclesiastical power, the corruptions of public men, the dangers that beset our cherished institutions; and shall we not be convinced? It calls upon us in the name of Liberty! Let us spring up to the rescue and come forth like an army with banners! Let us teach these enemies of a foreign ecclesiastical power and corrupt politicians that our ballots will be cast only for those men, irrespective of party, who shall be actuated by American principles!

Up, up, sons and daughters of America! Your country calls you, and the danger is pressing. Let us meet the enemies of our liberties and institutions as only patriots can; and under the fold of our country's banner let us swear that we will no longer be the slave to the demagogue. With a single purpose, and with hearts sternly resolute, we will gather round the altars of liberty and rekindle the expiring embers of patriotism, and with one voice resolve that the insidious power of foreign ecclesiasticism shall no longer rule the land; that the strong within our gates shall not become our master, and that "Americans alone shall rule America."

"O Sons of America! list to the cry!

The loud, fearful warning that rings to the sky.

Shall foul, blackened falsehood unanswered be borne,

And Americans be branded with insult and scorn?

Strike! strike for the country, the freedom ye crave!

Religion and home, and the Puritan's grave!

Oh, fight as they fought on the land and the sea,

And die as they died, but in leaving us free!"

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE LOYAL WOMEN
OF AMERICAN LIBERTY.

National Headquarters, Room 10, Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.